

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,013	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanine A Goldberg	1634	
<b>All Participants:</b>		<b>Status of Application:</b> _____	
(1) <u>Jeanine A Goldberg</u> .		(3) <u>Dr. Mai Nguyen</u> .	
(2) <u>Dr. Khue Nguyen</u> .		(4) _____.	
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>26 May 2004</u>		<b>Time:</b> _____	
<b>Type of Interview:</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
If Yes, provide a brief description:			
<b>Part I.</b>			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
<i>The 103 obvious-type rejections</i>			
Claims discussed:			
Prior art documents discussed:			
<i>Jong, Lefevre</i>			
<b>Part II.</b>			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:			
See Continuation Sheet			
<b>Part III.</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)		_____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The nature of the invention was discussed to determine whether there were any elements of the specification which could be added to the claims and distinguish over the prior art. The applicant explained the invention and reiterated the quantitative nature of the invention. The examiner explained that the invention was novel (free of 102 rejections), however with regard to the question of obviousness (103 rejections), the examiner does not deem the invention to be non-obvious. The examiner acknowledges that applicants are prosecuting the application pro se and has tried to be of substantial assistance, however is unable to distinguish the teachings over the art. .